

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 955

UD 025 787

AUTHOR Raywid, Mary Anne
TITLE Reflections on Understanding, Studying, and Managing Magnet Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 23p.; In: Planning and Developing Magnet Schools: Experience and Observation; see UD 025 778.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Magnet Schools; Program Design; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *School Desegregation; *Urban Schools; *Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS Excellence in Education

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses magnet schools generally and evaluates the other papers included with it in a single volume. Magnet schools have been fairly successful in meeting their stated goals, and in some cities, such as New York, they are so popular that parents must compete to gain their children's entrance. Still, magnets have tended to rely more on curricular than instructional innovation, and thus they have failed to meet the increasingly apparent need for new pedagogies that can succeed with disadvantaged youngsters. This tendency will likely change in the future, along with new reform efforts in the area of school structure. Magnet schools might well become the vanguard in the search for new ways to organize and present schooling. Research on magnet schools has emphasized either the view of the practitioner within a particular program or an outsider's view, but some combination of both may be needed. The design and monitoring of magnet plans is crucial to their success, but success also depends heavily upon how organizational structures, culture, and climate are interwoven. The papers in this volume underscore concerns about a shift in emphasis from equity to excellence, and a tendency to direct too much attention to educational technology and not enough to the original goals of magnets. Magnet schools offer great promise, but officials must take fuller advantage of the unit autonomy extended to them in order to avoid the problems of other schools. (KH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED284955

REFLECTION ON UNDERSTANDING, STUDYING,
AND MANAGING MAGNET SCHOOLS

MARY ANNE RAYWID
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPRING, 1987

10025787

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

U.S. Department of Education
Spring, 1987

9-24-87
Mary Anne Raywid
Hofstra University

REFLECTIONS ON UNDERSTANDING, STUDYING, AND MANAGING MAGNET SCHOOLS

Introduction

The papers comprising this volume represent an unusual collection, drawing on the work both of school people and researchers. In principle, at least, the collection extends both the practitioner's knowledge-in-practice -- the sort of knowledge available only to one actively engaged in a pursuit -- and the analyses of those who study that pursuit and have observed it in multiple contexts. The two perspectives are, indeed, visible in these statements. But it is important to note at the outset that the practitioner statements are not those of people who operate magnet schools. Rather they are the perspectives of those who manage systems of such schools. This is a vitally important perspective. Indeed, it extensively sets the parameters for how magnet schools will operate. But it is a vantage point quite different from that of the practitioner functioning daily within one of those schools. And, as is the case for all of us, the focus of these magnet system administrators, their concerns, and the challenges they see, are marked as much by their particular roles and responsibilities as by the questions they address.

I was invited, as a scholar/advocate of magnets and other schools of choice, to review the statements and to share some reactions, along with my own sense of the prospects and challenges facing magnet schools. It is an interesting time at which to do so. After more than a decade, the magnet school movement appears active and growing. There remain approximately 500 school districts under desegregation orders.¹ And

magnet schools remain the most favored alternative to forced busing. Kansas City is to open 46 magnet schools in the next several years,² and as of next year, St. Paul is increasing its present 13 programs by five.³ It is becoming increasingly familiar to see ads in national publications for magnet school principals and magnet system directors, and increasingly common to hear of districts turning to magnet schools as the best route to school revitalization and effectiveness. The unanticipated finding of the major magnet school study to date⁴ -- that such schools are quite effective in improving school quality -- might alone tend to ensure an increase in the number of such programs. And the enhanced public confidence which magnets inspire may keep the demand high for adopting and extending the arrangement. One hears with growing frequency about parents removing their children from private schools to enroll them in public magnets⁵ -- and about the long lines of parents who have spent up to six days in a line, waiting to enroll their children⁶ -- and about the high schools with 900 openings and 35,000 applicants. (It has been commented that some New York City magnet high schools are harder to get into than Harvard or Yale!)⁷

It does not appear unlikely, then, that the number of the nation's magnet schools and systems will continue to grow. When one adds the demand generated by the growing proportion of disadvantaged students in our schools -- and the overwhelming numbers of students deemed 'at risk' -- it appears that strong pressures for magnet schools may well be with us for at least a decade. The programs that open may also be extensively influenced by two other prospects as well.

It is very likely that schools will be experiencing intensified pressures for instructional innovation. There is substantial evidence

that there ~~has~~ been little fundamental change in this regard for a century or more.⁸ ~~Most~~ schools ~~have~~ tended to rely more heavily on curricular innovation than on instructional.⁹ And indeed, the evidence suggests that in other ~~kind~~ of schools of choice as well, teachers have been less innovative with respect to pedagogy than they have sought to be.¹⁰ Yet the array of evidence showing that schools are not working for large numbers of youngsters -- the truancy and dropout rates, the incidence of misbehavior, the failure rates, the minimal-work 'treaties,' the alarming extent of student 'disengagement' -- all testify to the number of young people who need a different kind of instruction in order to succeed. The proportion of disadvantaged youngsters in schools, those most likely to be 'at risk,' is currently estimated at 30%, and their number is increasing rapidly.¹¹ There will be strong pressures on schools to find new pedagogies that can succeed with such youngsters. Magnet programs, with their innovative tradition and their capacity for flexibility, will be encouraged to devise such pedagogical strategies. If they respond positively, this too will intensify the demand for magnet schools.

A second emerging focus is also likely to affect magnet schools and their development. This is the persistent demand for revising school structure. According to some, this demand is likely to be the main target of reform efforts for the next several years.¹² By "restructuring" is usually meant a fundamental reordering of school resources and control arrangements -- school time, staffing and staff deployment, student groupings, school governance. Because of their typically smaller size and greater flexibility, schools of choice are in a good position to pilot the search for new structures. They might very well become the vanguard in the search for new ways to organize and present schooling. If so, this

will surely strengthen the demand for such programs, as well as their direction.

Whether or not they choose to move in the directions just indicated, magnet school prospects appear strong for the remainder of the century. If they are to function optimally, however, a great deal more needs to be known about them. There has been a fair amount of investigation of their contribution to desegregation. But there has been much less regarding such matters as their educational effectiveness, student achievement, the organizational conditions of success. There is much to be done before we even have detailed descriptions of such matters, let alone explanations of contributants and obstacles to success. For instance, just how important is teacher choice to magnet school success? What types of students succeed in magnet schools and are there some who do less well than in their previous school? Do particular types of students succeed or fail in particular types of magnet programs? Does it make much difference to effectiveness whether the magnet is full-time or part-time ... a school-within-a-school or a mini-school or a separate school ... how it is administered? Are different role allocation patterns systematically associated with success or failure? And then there are all the questions that need to be answered about the optimal context for magnet schools -- e.g., about the most effective strategies for designing and launching and coordinating such programs, for obtaining professional organization cooperation, for coordinating parent information programs and recruitment procedures. Thus, a great deal needs to be learned, and it is to be hoped that far more extensive research will soon be under way.

Meanwhile, attempts to understand magnet schools have been marked by two rather different perspectives. They are the two broad types repre-

sented in this collection -- which anthropologists have called the Emic and the Etic viewpoints.¹³ The Emic account of situations and events is the explanations offered by those who are enmeshed and involved in them. Such explanations typically provide a depth and richness of understanding which is difficult for outsiders to achieve. In contrast, the Etic account is that of observers who are not themselves part of the conditions and activities under study. It is thought to possess the advantages of objectivity and systematic warrant.

We can all cite Emic accounts that appear misleading and useless (such as the attribution by primitive peoples of natural events to evil forces); and we can also recall Etic explanations which seem simply to have missed the boat so far as insightful understanding is concerned (such as the insistence that a criminal 'type' accounts for crime, or that bumps on the head indicate character and ability). So it is difficult to argue the assured superiority of the one approach over the other. It is possible, however, to identify the major challenges to each approach so far as its potential for improving practice is concerned.

The major relevant challenges to the Etic approach are, of course, pertinence and accessibility: If Etics offer explanations leaving events beyond the control of practitioners (e.g., by attributing school failure to socio-economic status or parent orientation), then they cannot be surprised if practitioners turn elsewhere to guide their practice. Or, if the explanations offered by Etics are so esoteric or obtuse as to be inaccessible to practitioners, then they cannot hope to make a difference -- at least until an able translator comes along.

The major challenge to the Emic explanation of circumstances and events is warrantability. Even if it can be assumed that accurate predic-

tions confirm one's interpretation of things, it can still be asked whether that interpretation can safely be applied elsewhere. To put it differently, the Emic approach must contend with the problem of generalizability. The clear strengths of the practitioner papers in this collection lead me to cite some examples of how the generalizability question arises. Recall that the descriptions and suggestions of these authors come from people who have really "been there." Each is experienced at dealing with the challenges he or she describes, and very probably the advice is well tested by that experience. The hitch, however, is that other practitioners with successful programs would be offering different, even contradictory advice. Two or three examples seem worthwhile.

William Pearson's paper finds magnet schools quite costly, and he concludes that "resourcing magnet schools is a formidable task" demanding "a carefully designed plan for [supplementary] resource garnering." (p. 29) Yet the most comprehensive magnet school study to date suggests that after start-up, average per pupil costs in the magnet schools of most districts are not a great deal higher than overall district averages -- and, indeed, that elementary school magnets average lower per pupil costs than do other elementary schools in the district!¹⁴ Is Mr. Pearson in error, then? Not for his situation. What is necessary, however, is to establish the contingencies of his situation to be able to say "under circumstances X, Y, and Z, magnet schools will require higher per pupil expenditures." Or, to cite a different example, Grace Fairlee recommends a Gifted and Talented magnet as a promising start likely to attract parents. Quite probably. But such a tying of magnet themes to particular ability levels has sometimes proved regrettable elsewhere, provoking charges of elitism, tracking, and betrayal of the very equity-focused

purposes giving rise to magnet schools. Again, research is needed in order to establish the conditions under which the advice "start with a Gifted and Talented program" is good advice, and when it seems contra-indicated. As a final example, Faye Bryant, Lee Laws, Ms. Fairlee, and Mr. Pearson all urge careful, detailed, advance planning including needs assessments for new magnet programs. There is considerable evidence to support such a recommendation. The form of the planning, however, and more particularly, just who should do it -- remains a major question. The conventional purposes of thoroughness, coordination, control are all well served by the recommendation of these authors that the planning occur at the district level, by central office administrators. Yet considerable experience recommends instead that the teachers to be involved in the program must do the bulk of such planning. Once again, only much-needed research can confirm the relevant contingencies -- the circumstances under which it makes sense to have administrators do most of the planning and those recommending that teachers do it instead.

Thus, a great deal of research remains to be done on magnet schools. Meanwhile, however, some interesting aspects of these schools can be noted, and of the choice systems they comprise.

Ironies

There are many ironies associated with schools of choice, and these frame the central challenges with which magnet schooling must contend. Some are worth mentioning, since they so clearly indicate the major pitfalls to be avoided. In the first place, of course, magnet schools got their start as a desegregation strategy and mechanism. Yet, it has

sometimes appeared that they have desegregated schooling for white youngsters to a greater extent than they have done so for their intended minority beneficiaries.¹⁵ It has, indeed, been charged that magnet schools have left some systems more segregated than they were without them.¹⁶ Magnet schools are an equity measure, but some have disproportionately burdened their beneficiaries -- e.g., by requiring more busing for more minority than for majority students.¹⁷ Moreover, it is sometimes difficult to get the neediest students and their families to take advantage of the very opportunity magnets are designed to extend to them: choice.

A further irony has been noted in the suggestion that magnet schools must appear superior in order to attract students -- but they must not be superior in any significant sense lest they create inequities in the system of which they are a part.¹⁸ And despite the equity commitment, magnet schools can quite blatantly create and sanction tracking arrangements.

Installed in some locales with the distinct hope of making schools more responsive, the most successful ones have sometimes become less so than schools of assignment! The principal of one of New York's most successful magnet schools reports that when she put any questions to the very popular school of choice that her own children attended, the answer was always the same: "Many others are waiting to get in here, if you don't like it."

A final pair of ironies: it very early appeared (as far back as Alum Rock, the first choice system venture) that instead of empowering parents, as presupposed, a choice system actually empowered teachers instead.¹⁹ Some took this to be an advantage, and have sought schools of choice with

it in mind. Yet that search, too, has sometimes proved ironic, because while magnet schools can yield substantial increases in teacher autonomy and empowerment, they can also yield significant decreases therein: the latter is particularly likely, as Mary Metz shows,²⁰ when insufficient planning time is coupled with contractual provisions enabling all teachers who so choose to remain in a building, whether sympathetic to its new magnet or not. In such a situation, the only way the principal can implement the new theme is with a firm hand and close monitoring. Ergo, greater teacher autonomy quite understandably becomes less.

The reason for documenting this list of ironies is not to impugn the magnet concept -- to which I am strongly committed. It is, however, to suggest that a great deal rides on the implementation details. One can implement the magnet school proposal to precisely opposite goals -- and arrange the system so as to fulfill them quite successfully. This places heavy burdens on the design phase of any magnet program -- as well as on the execution phase. It also means that close monitoring of the system will remain important, in order to be sure that it continues to serve instead of undermining the very purposes to which it was established.

Organizational Properties

The 'insider' or Emic explanation of magnet school success is likely to be offered in terms of pedagogical technology: It is typically a unique curriculum, or distinctive curricular packaging, which is said to account for the effectiveness. Occasionally explanations are framed in terms of superior delivery systems, but usually curriculum is given most of the credit. At least some Etica would offer quite a different sort of

explanation, identifying the success secrets quite otherwise. Because these explanations offer new directions in which magnet schools might look to improve themselves -- and new concerns in the design of subsequent magnet schools -- it might be useful to explore them.

One increasingly convincing explanation for magnet school success is to be found in the work of organizational experts. They suggest that school effectiveness may be less a matter of what is done -- i.e., the curriculum taught -- than of the overall context in which that occurs. Schools of choice, they point out, are often smaller than schools of assignment. They can thus afford less complexity and bureaucratization. They are therefore frequently less hierarchical. This enables them to retain more flexibility with respect to roles and operation. Moreover, their charge to be distinctive automatically yields exemption from some districtwide regulations -- and such exemption enables them to be more responsive to the clientele with which they deal. The smaller size, plus the assigned mission, also make for quite different role allocations in many schools of choice. There may be fewer specialists and, in any event, the roles of classroom teachers are likely to be expanded. It is typically necessary, for instance, for magnet school teachers to write their own curriculum -- a rare expectation of teachers in other schools. This need, in turn, frequently puts them into collaborative relationships with other teachers, which is also unusual in most schools today.

There seems to be substantial evidence that it is these sorts of features of schools of choice that loom large in explaining their success. That evidence is coming from several different sources. One is the literature on corporate excellence and what makes for productivity in the workplace.²¹ That literature is highly relevant to understanding schools,

of course, not only because teachers are workers in schools, but because we expect students to be also. Another increasingly rich source is research on private schools, which is pointing to a number of structural contrasts in private and public school organization, and attributing strong private school advantages directly to these features.²² And as at least some of these researchers have pointed out, there are distinct organizational similarities between public schools of choice and private schools.²³

The relevance of pointing to organizational structures and arrangements as plausible explanations for the success of magnet schools should be clear: if it is these sorts of properties which extensively account for magnet school success, then we want to be sure to incorporate and maintain them in schools of choice. Such an understanding of the requisites of success should enable us better to capitalize on our assets and to avoid undermining them inadvertently.

There is another, related Etic account of the success of schools of choice that might also prove useful. It, too, locates the explanation in properties of the school as an organization, but these are less tangible and more ephemeral properties: the culture and climate of such schools. Visitors in schools of choice often comment on their remarkable tone and flavor. One is simply struck with quite a different set of feelings on entering such a school, in contrast to other schools. This is a matter of school climate. Many have attributed to schools of choice a "user friendliness" missing from most schools. There is a personalizing and a responsiveness to individuals which strengthens their sense of affiliation with the school. They thus incline to identify themselves with it, to feel a sense of ownership in relation to it, and to assume responsibility toward

it. Because such effects are often associated with all who are affiliated with a school of choice -- teachers and parents as well as students -- it is not surprising that considerable collegiality and personal association often evolve.

Some analysts attribute the climate of an organization to its culture -- i.e., to the shared beliefs, commitments, and assumptions so fundamental to the group that they have become its taken-for-granted reality.²⁴ Schools of choice often tend to have strong homogeneous cultures, in the sense that a wide number of beliefs and operating assumptions are common to their affiliates. This comes in part from the choice feature enabling staff and students alike to affiliate with the school that comes closest to their own orientation. It assures that there will be a broader range of fundamental agreement and more commitment to a shared sense of mission than most schools enjoy. This condition (mission consensus), plus others associated with choice (e.g., heightened student motivation, and student similarity or commonality in some educationally significant sense) enable teachers to afford a sense of efficacy that is not widely shared elsewhere in public schools. That is, fundamental expectations of success -- and an ensuing confidence and optimism -- are often key elements in the cultures of schools of choice.

Even such a brief account suggests how closely organizational structures, culture, and climate are interwoven and affect one another. The evidence supporting their role in the success and effectiveness of schools suggests that magnet schools might well want to exploit such avenues for maintaining and enhancing their success. To date they have not tended to do so, instead concentrating their attention and efforts rather exclusively on their curricular specialty. Other sorts of public

schools of choice -- alternative schools in particular -- have seemed much more oriented toward the importance of organizational features. Whether consciously or otherwise, private schools have also often reaped the benefits of their organizational properties. But to date, magnet schools have appeared to take relatively slight notice of them. It might be that such concern could yield better insight on what one is doing right -- and hence, better means for improving that and firmer assurance of being able to understand and control the situation when things are not going well.

Concerns

Despite the clear strengths of these papers, they underscore for me some concerns about directions and tendencies in magnet systems. The first is a possible shift in emphasis from equity to excellence. Such a temptation is strong and eminently understandable: it appears the whole world is demanding Excellence -- and with the clear evidence that magnet schools are an extremely promising route to improved school quality²⁵ (possibly even the most assured route to Effective Schools),²⁶ the temptation to shift focus is reasonable. Yet a great deal remains to be done to satisfy the equity needs that originally gave rise to magnet schools. And as many have pointed out, the search for educational excellence has not always been pursued in ways compatible with the requisites of equity.

More specifically, I am concerned that magnet systems seem so often to concentrate their resources on programs for the more fortunate youngster -- the "Gifted and Talented" or the one with high aptitude in the "Performing Arts" or the budding scholar in "Math and Science." This is an understandable turn in the quest for excellence, since one of the

meanings of that term is outstandingness or statistical atypicality. But such a development often undermines the pursuit of equity, since it is obviously the weakest not the ablest students who appear to need the most help and encouragement. And those who do are quite typically excluded from magnet schools. A good case has also been made for the importance and the lack of programs for the average youngster²⁷ -- who is also excluded from many of the magnet programs we have established.²⁸ Without arguing that all magnets should be open to all students (which could immediately prove self-defeating for a number of programs), it appears that considerably more resources, effort, and imagination might very desirably go into magnets targeted for average to at risk students. If the choice movement is to produce a generation of excellence, and not just a well-schooled elite, then a much broader focus is necessary in designing magnet schools. The challenge is not simply a matter of creating the conditions that enable the ablest to succeed; it is rather, in terms suggested by a study of corporate excellence, eliciting "extraordinary performance from ordinary people."²⁹

A strengthened equity focus might also recommend a stronger preoccupation with integration than is often encountered. It very early became obvious that desegregating a school is a long way from integrating it. Short of deliberate structures and arrangements and activities to stimulate positive interaction among different racial groups within a school, "desegregation" may just move segregation indoors. I wish we were hearing more about the use in magnet schools of the activities and strategies that are effective in integrating mixed-race classrooms. Such approaches have been developed and are available. I just wish there were more evidence of their widespread use in magnet schools.

I am concerned too lest the promise of schools of choice be lost in the mechanics of institutionalizing them. In the nature of the case, as soon as we undertake widescale implementation of an idea, we must attend to mechanics -- the procedures and arrangements and management details that operationalize the idea. The trick is not to get bogged down in the technology and forget the goals. I hope that is not happening in large choice systems, but it is a constant danger. A successful magnet school depends as much on heart and soul as on effective technology and delivery systems. We have recently learned a great deal more about the nature of heart and soul in organizations, and how to cultivate such qualities. We would do well to put some of our effort and attention directly into such cultivation.

Some say there is a major lesson for other enterprises in what happened to the railroads in this country. Once a major American institution with a pivotal role in our economy, they are now quite peripheral and only marginally self-sustaining. One provocative explanation is that the decline was due to a failure of leadership and vision: the managers saw the challenge before them as running the system -- making trains available, on time, in good operating order. Management's internal preoccupations -- the focus on running their own systems -- caused them to ignore the goals of their clientele: getting people and products to their destinations. Thus, other forms of transportation replaced the trains when the alternatives proved more responsive to external needs and demands.³⁰ Perhaps any major enterprise must consistently guard against such a development. Indeed, some have asserted that this is just what has happened in education and that it is what is wrong with the regular schools in big cities. But it can happen

in magnet schools as well. As the demands of large-scale options systems become more intricate and urgent, the temptations toward internal preoccupation become stronger. Schools of choice must not be lured into dealing only with the technological problems. They must devise ways to keep themselves looking outward -- to remain attuned to the concerns and desires of students and their families. Or they will become just one more component in the self-preoccupied bureaucracies at least some of them were designed to offset.

Conclusion

I will close with a final comment on magnet school prospects and how to realize them. I am convinced that magnets and other schools of choice offer tremendous promise. Indeed, despite current limitations on our knowledge, there is much to suggest that such schools may eventually prove the Cinderella of our reform efforts.³¹ They could be just the kind of institutions that reformers have been looking for. There is a surprising amount of indirect research support for such a speculation. It comes from study not directly of magnet schools but of private schools, of those labeled 'Effective Schools,' and of successful corporate practice. This research suggests that many magnet schools begin with the essential conditions upon which educational excellence must be built -- reduced size, a commitment to differentiation and responsiveness, increased autonomy of the administrative unit. Some of them have capitalized most successfully on these assets -- so that it already seems clear, for instance, that magnet schools can sustain superior leadership,³² and that at least some schools of choice can claim superior teacher commitment and

investment³³ and extraordinary staff morale.³⁴ Indeed, some private school researchers have concluded that schools of choice in the public sector have the potential for bringing the same sorts of benefits to public education that private schools enjoy.³⁵

Thus, magnet schools offer promise extending well beyond the impressive positives they have realized to date. If any single piece of advice could yield fuller realization of that promise, it might lie in suggesting less innovative timidity. For the next decade, magnet schools can and should be in the vanguard, offering leadership and direction to other schools in the revitalization so needed in American education. But to do so, many would need to experiment with even more venturesome curricular departures than most have undertaken so far. Others would have to begin experimenting with instructional as well as curricular innovation. New pedagogies are urgently needed, schools of choice are perhaps our best prospective source, and creativity along these lines would be most desirable.

Finally, but by no means least, I would urge officials to insist that magnet schools take far fuller advantage of the unit autonomy extended them -- i.e., the exemption from district practice and procedure attending the charge to become a school that is distinctive. In particular, such autonomy might desirably be used to depart from traditional school structure. As David Clark has commented about Effective Schools, there is a danger that magnet schools may remain "for the most part...dominated by conservative organizational perspectives." They may be far too tempted to "overemphasize the significance of bureaucratic characteristics" and thus to understand successful programs as "well organized bureaucracies that work."³⁶ As a sharp and perceptive critic has already warned, strong

top-down management and the tight control that has operated in some magnet schools not only fails to stimulate innovative practice but may even defeat it. Such management practices "help bring about mechanistic, disengaged, depressed teaching...[and]...the exit of some of our best teachers."³⁷ Certainly, magnet schools must move quickly and decisively to avoid this sort of recapitulation of the problems of other schools. To fulfill their promise and substantially improve public education, magnet schools must be freed to pursue the organizational innovation essential to the programmatic creativity we have asked of them.

Footnotes

- 1 "Magnetic Attraction," The Economist, October 18, 1986, reprinted in The Educational Excellence Network, December 1986/January 1987, p. 103
- 2 "Kansas City Proposes Magnetization," School Board News, October 15, 1986, p. 6
- 3 According to Superintendent David A. Bennett, in Executive Educator, February, 1987, p. A9
- 4 Rolf A. Blank et al., Survey of Magnet Schools: Analyzing A Model for Quality Integrated Education. Washington: James H. Lowry, September, 1983
- 5 See e.g., Leah Y. Latimer, "More Private School Pupils Are Going Public," Washington Post, March 1, 1987
- 6 See, e.g., Lawrence Feinberg, "A 'Crazy System' That Seems to Work," Washington Post, October 2, 1986; and Sally Kalson, "On the Magnet Front Lines," Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, November 14, 1986
- 7 See Diane Ravitch, "Making Good Schools Worse," New York Times, October 3, 1986; and Jane Perlez, "Board Votes to Ease Admission to 8 Career High Schools in New York City," New York Times, September 18, 1986
- 8 See Larry Cuban, "How Did Teachers Teach, 1890-1980?" Theory Into Practice, 22 (Summer, 1983), pp. 159-165.
- 9 Blank et al., Op. cit.
- 10 William Parrett, "Alternative Schools: What's Really Happening in the Classrooms." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, Los Angeles, April, 1981
- 11 Henry M. Levin, The Educationally Disadvantaged: A National Crisis. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures, July, 1985
- 12 See, e.g., Chris Pípho, "Restructuring the Schools: States Take on the Challenge," Education Week, November 26, 1986, p. 19
- 13 The distinction is elaborated by Marvin Harris in The Rise of Anthropological Theory. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1968, pp. 568-604
- 14 Blank et al., Op. cit.
- 15 Charles Willie, "School Integration: Everyone Benefits; Let's Find Way to Do It More Fairly," The Boston Herald,
- 16 P. Caldwell, "Mandatory Busing More Effective than Voluntary: Desegregation Studied in 49 Large Districts," Education Week, March 3, 1982, pp. 1 and 14

- 17 Ian Harris, "The Inequities of Milwaukee's Plan," Integrated Education, 21 (1984), pp. 173-177
- 18 Mary H. Metz, Different by Design: The Context and Character of Three Magnet Schools, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986
- 19 David K. Cohen and Eleanor Farrar McGowan, "Power to the Parents?" July, 1976. Mimeo
- 20 Op. cit.
- 21 See e.g., Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies. New York: Harper & Row, 1982
- 22 See, e.g., John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, Politics, Markets, and the Organization of Schools. Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, Project Report No. 85-A15, November, 1985
- 23 Donald Erickson, The British Columbia Story: Antecedents and Consequences of Aid to Private Schools. Los Angeles: Institute for the Study of Private Schools, 1982
- 24 See, e.g., R.H. Kilmann, M.J. Saxton, and R. Serpa, Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985
- 25 Blank et al., Op. cit.
- 26 The evidence with respect to the costs and attrition rates associated with school improvement projects at least gives rise to question whether the magnet school route to improvement is not more assured and less costly. See, e.g., Eugene E. Eubanks and Daniel U. Levine, "A First Look at Effective Schools Projects in New York City and Milwaukee," Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1983, pp. 697-702
- 27 See Arthur G. Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David K. Cohen, The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985
- 28 See, e.g., Jane Perlez, Op. cit.
- 29 Peters and Waterman, Op. cit.
- 30 This analogy is suggested in Dialogue for Change: Options for Restructuring K-12 Education. Detroit: Metropolitan Affairs Corp., 1985
- 31 The suggestion is that of Thomas Gregory, in "Alternative School As Cinderella: What the Reform Reports Didn't Look at and Don't Say," Changing Schools, 13:3 (Fall, 1985), pp. 2-4

- 32 Rolf K. Blank, "Principal Leadership in Urban High Schools: Analysis of Variation in Leadership Characteristics." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco, April, 1986
- 33 Mary Anne Raywid, The Current Status of Schools of Choice in Public Secondary Education. Hempstead, NY: Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University, 1982
- 34 See, e.g., F. Gladstone and Malcolm Levin, Public Alternative School Teacher Study. Toronto: Ontario Institute of Educational Studies. Mimeo, 1982
- 35 Donald Erickson, Op. cit.
- 36 David L. Clark, Linda S. Lotto, Terry A. Astuto, "Effective Schools and School Improvement: A Comparative Analysis of Two Lines of Inquiry," Educational Administration Quarterly, 20:3 (Summer, 1984), p. 63
- 37 Linda M. McNeil, "Exit, Voice and Community: Magnet Teachers' Responses to Standardization," Educational Policy 1:1 (1987), p. 93